REMARKS

Careful examination of the application is sincerely appreciated.

Claims 1 – 9, 12 – 16, 18 and 19 are pending in the application. Independent claims are amended to remove features that are not necessary to overcome the prior art of record. It is respectfully submitted that pursuant to 37 CFR 1.116 and MPEP, section 714.12, this amendment presents rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal, and entry thereof is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,880,732 (Tryding) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,556,217 (Makipaa et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,018 (Erekson). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tryding in view of Makipaa, further in view of Erekson, and still further in view of U.S. Patent 6,775,558 (Ranta et al.). Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tryding in view of Makipaa, further in view of Erekson, and still further in view of U.S. Patent 6,330,448 (Otsuka et al.). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tryding in view of Erekson. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tryding in view of Makipaa, further in view of Erekson, and still further in view of U.S. Patent 6,542,742 (Schramm et al.). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tryding in view of Makipaa, further in view of Erekson, and still further in view of U.S. Patent 5,390,339 (Bruckert et al.). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tryding in view of Makipaa, further in view of Erekson, and still further in view of U.S. Patent 5,995,829 (Broderick). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

PAGE 7/13 * RCVD AT 10/24/2005 2:14:17 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/34 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:914 332 0615 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-26

unpatentable over Tryding in view of Makipaa, further in view of Erekson, and still further in view of U.S. Patent 6,473,630 (Baranowski et al.). Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tryding in view of Erekson, and further in view of Baranowski. Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections for the following reasons.

Tryding is directed to a system for employing an external display monitor for a mobile telephone. Makipaa is directed to a system that includes a content server for rendering and adapting an appropriate sized display for displaying web pages on various devices. Erekson uses Bluetooth messaging to control remote devices.

In the Final Office Action, it is asserted that the cited combination of references discloses or suggests all of the elements of Applicant's claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

If Tryding's mobile telephone 10 and display monitor 15 (as shown in Fig. 1 of the patent) combined with Makipaa's content provider 10, content server 20 and user terminal 30 (as shown in Fig. 1 of the patent), then the result still lacks a communication session between Tryding's mobile telephone 10 and Makipaa's content server 20. No portion in those two references discloses such a communication. This means that the combination fails to teach or suggest "**establishing a primary communication session** via a transcoding proxy with a content server" as recited in Applicant's claim 1 (emphasis added). In other words, the combination of Tryding and Makipaa does not show a mobile device establishing a communication session with a content provider 10, as required by Applicant's claim 1. Both Tryding and Makipaa can be interpreted to show Applicant's secondary communication session, but not the first one. So, the analysis of references in

PAGE 8/13 * RCVD AT 10/24/2005 2:14:17 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/34 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:914 332 0615 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-26

the Final Office Action, allegedly disclosing the above feature of the present invention, cannot be supported factually.

Furthermore, since there is no disclosure of the primary communication session in Tryding and Makipaa, it follows that the prior art combination is deficient in disclosing "establishing a primary communication session **via a transcoding proxy** with a content server", as recited in Applicant's claim 1 (emphasis added). In other words, the combination of Tryding and Makipaa does not show a mobile device establishing a communication session with a content provider **via the content server 20**, as required by Applicant's claim 1. Once again, the assertion in the Final Office Action to the contrary is factually unsustainable.

Still further and contrary to the Final Office Action, the combination of Tryding, Makipaa and Erekson lacks "wherein the auxiliary communication means are arranged for receiving an assistance message from the auxiliary rendering device" as recited in Applicant's claim 1. It is not disclosed in the patent that Erekson's remote devices 610 – 630 include an auxiliary **rendering** device as in the present invention (emphasis added). In addition, Erekson fails to teach or suggest that the characteristics and capabilities of remote devices 610 – 630 include **rendering** capabilities as in the present invention (emphasis added).

According to the Final Office Action, Erekson is relied upon only for the proposition of "a system where the characteristics and capabilities of devices are identified in response to messages" (see page 4, lines 1 – 4 of the Final Office Action). Even if, for the sake of argument, it is assumed that Erekson does teach that feature, Erekson still does not disclose the above features of Applicant's invention as recited in

PAGE 9/13 * RCVD AT 10/24/2005 2:14:17 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/34 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:914 332 0615 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-26

claim 1 and discussed hereinabove. Thus, this patent fails to supplement Tryding and Makipaa to cure their deficiencies as discussed hereinabove.

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that Tryding, Makipaa and Erekson, whether alone or in combination, do not render obvious Applicant's claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 – 4 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 and inherit all of its features. Since claim 1 is allowable as discussed above, at least for those reasons claims 2 – 4 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2 – 4 is, therefore, earnestly solicited.

With respect to claim 5 which indirectly depends from claim 1, Ranta is relied upon only for the proposition of "a system where a connection between a terminal and an accessory device may be automatically activated when either of the devices realizes that it has data to be transmitted to the other device" (see page 9, lines 1 – 4 of the Final Office Action). Even if, for the sake of argument, it is assumed that Ranta does teach that feature, Ranta still does not disclose the above features of Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1 and discussed hereinabove. Thus, this patent fails to supplement Tryding, Makipaa and Erekson to cure their deficiencies as discussed hereinabove. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 6 and 15 which indirectly or directly depend from claim 1, Otsuka is relied upon only for the proposition of "a system where a device monitors a received signal to determine if it is lower than a threshold. If it is and a stronger signal is available, a handover request is transmitted" (see page 9, lines 16 et seq. of the Final Office Action). Even if, for the sake of argument, it is assumed that Otsuka does teach

PAGE 10/13 * RCVD AT 10/24/2005 2:14:17 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/34 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:914 332 0615 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-26

that feature, Otsuka still does not disclose the above features of Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1 and discussed hereinabove. Thus, this patent fails to supplement Tryding, Makipaa and Erekson to cure their deficiencies as discussed hereinabove. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 8 that contains the above-discussed features of claim 1, Applicant essentially repeats the above arguments with respect to independent claim 8 to submit that it is not rendered obvious by Tryding and Erekson. Withdrawal of the rejections is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Claim 9 is believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated for claim 8 and dependency therefrom. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 12 which depends from claim 1, Schramm is relied upon only for the proposition of "a system that monitors the capabilities for communication and selects only stations that support the capabilities of the MS" (see page 13, lines 1 – 3 of the Final Office Action). Even if, for the sake of argument, it is assumed that Schramm does teach that feature, Schramm still does not disclose the above features of Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1 and discussed hereinabove. Thus, this patent fails to supplement Tryding, Makipaa and Erekson to cure their deficiencies as discussed hereinabove. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 13 which depends from claim 1, Bruckert is relied upon only for the proposition of "a system that estimates one devices [sic] location and selects the station closest to the location estimates to serve it" (see page 13, lines 13 et seq. of the Final Office Action). Even if, for the sake of argument, it is assumed that Bruckert does

PAGE 11/13 * RCVD AT 10/24/2005 2:14:17 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/34 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:914 332 0615 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-26

teach that feature, Bruckert still does not disclose the above features of Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1 and discussed hereinabove. Thus, this patent fails to supplement Tryding, Makipaa and Erekson to cure their deficiencies as discussed hereinabove. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 14 which depends from claim 1, Broderick is relied upon only for the proposition of "a system with a timer that determines a length of time that is allowed for attempting to acquire service before determining that no device is available" (see page 14, lines 3 et seq. of the Final Office Action). Even if, for the sake of argument, it is assumed that Broderick does teach that feature, Broderick still does not disclose the above features of Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1 and discussed hereinabove. Thus, this patent fails to supplement Tryding, Makipaa and Erekson to cure their deficiencies as discussed hereinabove. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 16 which depends from claim 1, Baranowski is relied upon only for the proposition of "a system for rendering audio information externally" (see page 15, lines 1 et seq. of the Final Office Action). Even if, for the sake of argument, it is assumed that Baranowski does teach that feature, Baranowski still does not disclose the above features of Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1 and discussed hereinabove. Thus, this patent fails to supplement Tryding, Makipaa and Erekson to cure their deficiencies as discussed hereinabove. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

PAGE 12/13 * RCVD AT 10/24/2005 2:14:17 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/34 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:914 332 0615 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-26

With respect to claim 18 which indirectly depends from claim 1, claim 18 is believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated for claim 1 and dependency therefrom. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is not rendered obvious by the prior art of record and in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason this application is not considered to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By Larry Liberchuk

Larry Liberchuk, Reg. No. 40,352
Senior Corporate Counsel
914-333-9602

PAGE 13/13 * RCVD AT 10/24/2005 2:14:17 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/34 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:914 332 0615 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-26 P.13